United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/517,712	12/10/2004	Roberto Dalla Valle	58009-019001	9144		
Dable E Tonic	7590 02/02/2007	. EXAM	EXAMINER			
Pablo E Tapia Greenberg Tra		SAFAVI, N	SAFAVI, MICHAEL			
2450 Colorado Suite 400E	Avenue	. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
Santa Monica,	CA 90404	3673	3673			
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE		
3 MC	ONTHS	02/02/2007	PAF	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No. Applicant(s)						
		10/517,712	!	DALLA VALLE, ROBERTO				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
			M. Safavi		3673			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication app	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress		
WHIC - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MENTION OF THE MENTION O	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period w y will, by statute,	ATE OF THI 36(a). In no even will apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION t, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the ation to become ABANDONED	Lely filed the mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on	_•					
2a)□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		action is no	n-final.				
3)□								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 10-15 is/are pending in the	application	1.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>14</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	⊠ Claim(s) 10-13 and 15 is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or	election red	quirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers		•					
9)[The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner						
10)⊠	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 December 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)	a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* (See the attached detailed Office action	on for a list o	of the certifie	ed copies not received	d.			
Attachmen	• •							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	OTO-048\	4	I) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	10-340)	5	i) 🔲 Notice of Informal Pa				
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/04</u> .	6)						

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of Group I, (claims 10-13 and 15), in the reply filed on October 23, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim 14 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 23, 2006.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to under 37 CFR § 1.71 because of the following: Line 25 on page three of the specification makes reference to a "main claim". Line 28 on page three of the specification makes reference to "claims 6 to 8". Line 29 on page three of the specification makes reference to "dependent claims". The specification shall be clear and complete in and of itself without referencing any particular claim of the application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/517,712

Art Unit: 3673

Claim 11 appears dependent upon a cancelled claim.

Claim 12 appears dependent upon a cancelled claim.

Claim 13 appears dependent upon a cancelled claim.

Claim 14 appears dependent upon a cancelled claim.

Claim 15 appears dependent upon a cancelled claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 11, 13, and15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art process disclosed within the instant Background of the Invention in view of any of Baskin '030, Yukawa et al. '508, and United Kingdom reference 1,127,296, (UK '296).

As for **claim 10**, the instant Background of the Invention discloses as old and well known in the art the claimed invention except for the process of separating the second layer of polyethylene-coated paper from the panel by lifting and removing the second layer of polyethylene-coated paper "substantially in a single piece". However, each of Baskin '030, Yukawa et al. '508, and United Kingdom reference '296 teach application and utilization of a polyethylene sheet material forming a covering during a molding operation forming a stone material with subsequent removal of the polyethylene

Art Unit: 3673

sheet. Each of Baskin '030 and Yukawa et al. '508 teach application to a resin stone-like material while UK '296 describes use of a polyethylene coated paper in substantially a single piece, col. 4, line 61 of Baskin '030, col. 6, lines 55-67 of Yukawa et al. '508, and page 2, lines 46-48 of UK '296. Therefore, to have formed the synthetic resin stone-like sheet described within the instant Background of the Invention as by applying the polyethylene coated paper sheet and subsequently removing the sheet in substantially a single piece, thus allowing for easy processing of the resulting artificial stone panel, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by any of Baskin '030, Yukawa et al. '508, and United Kingdom reference 1,127,296.

As for **claim 11**, the instant Background of the Invention discloses as old and well known the process of polishing an artificial stone material.

As for **claims 13 and 15**, the instant Background of the Invention discloses as old and well known the process of utilizing a polyethylene-coated paper sheet, which has been formed by coating the paper with sprayed polyethylene.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art process disclosed within the instant Background of the Invention in view of any of Baskin '030, Yukawa et al. '508, and United Kingdom reference 1,127,296, (UK '296), as applied to claims 10, 11, and 13-15 above, and further in view of any of Orsini '510, Rostoker '172, Sakai '458, and Hoesch '401 and further in view of either of Lemelson '905, and Ballhausen '474.

The process of forming a stone slab as realized by the instant Background of the Invention in view of any of Baskin '030, Yukawa et al. '508, and UK '296 does not particularly include a step of polishing he resulting stone as by grinding with titanium grinding wheels. However, each of Orsini '510, Rostoker '172, Sakai '458, and Hoesch '401 teach polishing of a synthetic stone-like slab as by grinding an outer surface thereof, (col. 4, line 45 of Orsini '510, col. 2, lines 11-13 of Rostoker '172, col. 8, lines 16-25 of Sakai '458, and col. 3, lines 15-17 of Hoesch '401), while either of Lemelson '905 and Ballhausen '474 teach as old and well known utilization of titanium grinding wheels for polishing natural or artificial stone elements, (col. 3, lines 10-13 and 24-28 of Lemelson '905 and col. 1, line 18-30 and col. 2, lines 2-10 of Ballhausen '474). Therefore, to have subsequently polished the resulting synthetic stone panel of the modified process of the instant Background of the Invention, thus achieving an aesthetically accurate and pleasing appearance to the stone slab, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by any of Orsini '510, Rostoker '172, Sakai '458, and Hoesch '401 when further considering either of Lemelson '905, and Ballhausen '474.

Claim 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art process disclosed within the instant Background of the Invention in view of any of Baskin '030, Yukawa et al. '508, and United Kingdom reference 1,127,296, (UK '296), as applied to claims 10, 11, and 13-15 above, and further in view of any of Hare '224, Reed et al. '335, and Rottger et al. '953.

Application/Control Number: 10/517,712 Page 6

Art Unit: 3673

Though the instant Background of the Invention discloses as old and well known the process of utilizing a polyethylene-coated paper sheet, which has been formed by coating the paper with sprayed polyethylene, each of Hare '224, Reed et al. '335, and Rottger et al. '953 teach application of polyethylene to a paper sheet as by spraying, (col. 3, lines 65-68 of Hare '224, col. 2, lines 16-20 of Reed et al. '335, and col. 1, line 67 to col. 2, line 6 of Rottger et al. '953). Therefore, to have utilized a polyethylene-coated paper sheet, which has been formed by coating the paper with sprayed polyethylene, thus realizing any and all advantages of such a coated sheet, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Safavi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7046. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur., 8:30-5:00.

as taught by any of Hare '224, Reed et al. '335, and Rottger et al. '953.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Engle can be reached on (571) 272-6660. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

MICHAEL SAFAVI PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 154

M. Safavi January 05, 2007